

The Advent Review and Sabbath
Herald, vol. 72

esr

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1895	3
April 16, 1895	3
"‘As the Oracles of God’" The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 16.	3
April 23, 1895	7
"‘As the Oracles of God.’ The Question of Rights" The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 17.	7
December 3, 1895	11
"The Publishing House in London and the Sunday Law" The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 49.	11
December 17, 1895	17
"The Prosecution in London" The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 51.	17

1895

April 16, 1895

“As the Oracles of God” The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 16.

EJW

E. J. Waggoner

(London. Eng.)

When the apostle Paul was in Rome, a prisoner for the faith, he made this request of the brethren: Pray “for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds; that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.” *Ephesians 6:19, 20*. It will be noticed that his sole burden was for the gospel, that it might be presented in a proper manner. How one ought to speak in such a case is set forth by the apostle Peter: “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; ... that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ.” *1 Peter 4:11*. ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.1

While we are positively forbidden to take any thought, when we are brought before councils, as to how or what we shall speak (*Matthew 10:19*), we are as positively commanded to study the sacred oracles, since they are the only light for our steps. The Spirit will bring to our remembrance only that which has been pondered upon. In the Sabbath controversy which is now progressing the oracles of God must be especially prominent. The fourth commandment is our warrant for keeping the seventh day of the week, instead of any other day or no day at all; and therefore it is a matter of course that it must be that around which the battle will center. And it is a matter for thanksgiving that the case has been made so simple that an unlearned people need have no difficulty in presenting it. ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.2

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shall thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day as the Sabbath of

the Lord thy God; in it thou shall not do any work.” *Exodus 20:8-10*. And then follow the facts upon which the Sabbath is based in the account of its institution. In this we have a divine warrant that will do to present before kings. In the repetition of the commandment in *Deuteronomy 5:12*, we have the same thing stated in reverse order. “Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it.” This is the same as, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,” says to keep holy, or hallow, or to sanctify, are the same thing. The same Hebrew word is used in each case. *ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.3*

The force of the commandment rests on the word “sanctify.” What does it mean? The Scriptures make this very plain. It was very necessary that the people should be kept away from Mount Sinai when the Lord came down upon it to speak his law. So the Lord told Moses to set bounds so that the people could not come up to it. This was done, and when the Lord repeated the charge after he had come down, and Moses had gone up to meet him, Moses said to the Lord, “The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it.” *Exodus 19:23*. It is evident that a barrier—“bounds,”—had been erected which made a plain division between the ground that was sacred because of the presence of the Lord and that which was common. The mountain was so set off from the surrounding country that no one could fail to see the distinction. It was sanctified. *ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.4*

To sanctify a thing, therefore, means to make such a distinction between it and other things that nobody need have the slightest difficulty in distinguishing it from everything else. To sanctify the Sabbath as required by the commandment, is to make a marked difference between it and every other day of the week. *ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.5*

How is this difference shown in the case of the Sabbath? The commandment tells us. It says that we are to sanctify the Sabbath by resting upon it. The words, “Six days shall thou labor, and all thy work,” cannot be held to be an absolute command to work on every one of the other six days; but in the command to sanctify the seventh day we are charged to make a difference between it and the other six days in a matter of work. If we treat any other day as

we do the Sabbath, we break down the distinction and fail to sanctify the Sabbath.*ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.6*

If we work on the seventh day, it is very clear that we do not sanctify it, because we treat it just as we do all other days. Suppose now that instead of working on the seventh day, we rest, and that we also habitually rest on another day of the week as well; is it not clear that in this case we fail to sanctify the Sabbath just as surely as we do in the other? We break down the distinction, so that, so far as our actions are concerned, we could tell which of the two days is the Sabbath.*ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.7*

It is very clear, therefore, that in order to keep the Sabbath day according to the commandment, we must not only rest on the seventh day, but we must also habitually treat all other days of the week as laboring days. This would be true in any case; but when there is a day, as the first day, which is put forth as a rival to the Sabbath of the Lord, and which claims to be the Sabbath in its stead, the duty of emphasizing the difference becomes more urgent. We are by the commandment bound not only to show that the seventh day is the Sabbath, but also that the first day of the week is *not* the Sabbath. Of course in all this we are to keep in mind the golden rule, and the injunction of the apostle, "If it be possible, as much as lieth *in you*, live peaceably with all men." But by no means are we to compromise the truth of God, and when a power sets itself up against God, and demands that we give to the first day of the week the same outward honor that we give to the Sabbath of the Lord, then we are bound, as loyal subjects of the King of kings, to sanctify the Sabbath in the fullest sense of the word.*ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.8*

In a word, then, the fourth commandment is our sole sufficient warrant for working on Sunday when the laws of men require us to cease from labor on that day. Whether speaking to the people from the free platform or from the prisoner's dock, we have a simple and clear line of truth to present; namely, the commandment of the Lord of heaven and earth. There can be no stronger ground than this. It is so simple that any child can hold it against all opposition or cross-questioning, and it is all the warrant that is needed. Whoever, therefore, presents something aside from the commandment, by

just so much weakens the force of this testimony. As opposed to this ground, let us consider in another article the question of rights.*ARSH April 16, 1895, page 242.9*

(Concluded next week.)

April 23, 1895

“‘As the Oracles of God.’ The Question of Rights” The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 17.

EJW

E. J. Waggoner

(London. Eng.)(Concluded.)

Is it not a fact that we have a right to work on the first day of the week, and that this right is God-given?-Most certainly. Then may we not stand on this ground also, and demand our rights? The answer is, no: and the reason is plain.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 258.1*

1. There are many rights which we do yield without a murmur, in order to keep the peace, when there is no principle involved. We are required to do this as Christians. If we are going to stand for our rights in the matter of Sunday work, why not in every other matter? Of course the answer will be that we have no option in this case, since the commandment requires us to sanctify the seventh day. Then it is not a question of our rights but of the Lord's, and we ought not to obscure the real issue by putting ourselves forward.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 258.2*

2. We ought not to begin on any line that we are not prepared to carry to the end. Now what does a demand for our rights always involve?-Nothing less than a battle. For instance, I go into a public park and sit down. I have a right there, and am interfering with no one's peace. A man comes along and demands my seat, and persists in his demand. I can quietly wave my right to retain the seat, and seek another place, or I can insist on my right, and fight with the ruffian in order to maintain it. It needs no argument to show which would be the Christian course.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 258.3*

3. The case is clearer yet when it is a question of equal rights, as when I and the other man both come to the seat at the same time, we both have a right in the park, and both have the same right to that particular seat. We are both determined that we shall not yield

our rights. It is not necessary to indicate the result: but everybody knows that Christ would not be in it. Then certainly no Christian can take such ground. The Bible forbids us to come into conflict with government, or to take a position which involves rebellion against authority; for the insistence upon our rights means revolution if there be power and of with us to maintain our position. Of course no one contemplates any such thing. Then why should we begin on a line that we do not intend to carry to the end?*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 258.4*

4. The last paragraph presents a case perfectly parallel to the case between us and the government, provided we insist upon our rights, since the case is really one of equal rights. We have an undoubted right to keep the Sabbath of the Lord; but our neighbors have an equal right to disregard it. Christ said: "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." *John 12:47*. Of course the man who does not believe must take the consequences, and Christ made this very plain, by saying that the word would judge the unbeliever at the last day. But the fact is clear that God has given to every man the absolute right to believe or not, to obey him or to disobey him. Let no one become confused over *rights* and *right*. It is not right to do wrong, but God has given every man the liberty to do wrong if he chooses to do so and to suffer the consequences. This liberty, or freedom of will, we call "rights." Our work on this earth is to set before men what is right and the consequences of doing wrong.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 258.5*

Now the rights which belong to a single individual must necessarily belong to any number of individuals. Any State or government is but an aggregation of individuals, and therefore the rights which God has given to the single individual necessarily inhere in the State. Rulers, therefore, have the same liberty to disobey that we have to obey. When the men composing any government enact laws involving the violation of God's law, they are doing as a government just what each individual does when he refuses to obey the Lord; and they have the same liberty to do it as a government that they have to do it as individuals. Of course they will suffer if they exercise that liberty, but it is accorded to them nevertheless. God has set before all men life and death, good and evil, for them to

choose which they will.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.1*

When Christ was on trial before Pilate, he recognized the right of rulers to oppose the truth and to persecute. When Pilate said that he had power to crucify Jesus or to release him, Jesus said, "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above." *John 19:11*. Pilate, as governor, had the right given him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and cast his lot in with him, or to condemn him and suffer the consequences in the judgment. When a man becomes a ruler, he loses none of the rights that he had as a private individual, but his responsibility is greater.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.2*

It is sometimes said that governments have no right to legislate concerning the commandments in the first table of the law. But the law is undivided, and one part is as spiritual as another. Governments have the prerogative, or right, to defy the Lord in any way they choose. The Lord has not laid down in the Bible the rights and duties of governments, but of individuals, and he has not commissioned us to tell the world how governments should be conducted, but to tell individuals, whether private persons or rulers, what they must do to be saved. Wicked men, whether acting individually or as a government, have the liberty, or right, to reject the Lord and to persecute his people; and God's people have the right to acknowledge him and to suffer for it.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.3*

5. But the worst feature of this appeal for our rights is that it hides the commandment of the Lord, and elevates ourselves. Instead of witnessing for the Lord, we are witnessing for ourselves. But we are to speak only as the oracles of God, "that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." The only use that the Lord has for us in this world is to exalt himself and his law.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.4*

What, then, shall be our plea? Simply this: We have no option in this matter. God has given us the commandment, and we have no choice but to obey. Then the whole burden may be thrown upon the authorities, as in the case of the apostles,—“Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.

For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.” The responsibility is thus thrown upon them, whether they will array themselves against God or not.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.5*

By standing upon the Word of God alone, and refusing to make any other plea, we are preaching the word all the time. The commandment of God is held up as the greatest thing in the world,- as something which is above kings. Moreover we ourselves do not come into conflict with the government all. We are simply God’s mouthpieces, by which he tells the judges themselves that they are opposing him, and by which he warns them of the consequences. It is not a question of whether our rights shall be maintained as against the rights of government, but of whether the rulers will as individuals yield to God his rights.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.6*

Furthermore, we are on ground, from which we need never retreat one inch. We can speak with boldness, because our foundation is the everlasting truth of God. There is no defeat, even though we be put to death, because the truth triumphs. It will stand when everything else gives way. On this ground the accused can be perfectly calm while their accusers and even their judges tremble. When Paul opened his mouth boldly to speak the gospel in court, Felix trembled. And when the commandment of the Lord is steadfastly maintained, and it is made clear that we have no personal interest in the matter, and that our only anxiety is that the Lord should have his rights in the obedience of those for whom he gave himself, some will refuse to be any longer found fighting against God, and he will thus be glorified.*ARSH April 23, 1895, page 259.7*

December 3, 1895

“The Publishing House in London and the Sunday Law” The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald 72, 49.

EJW

E. J. Waggoner

Several brief notices of the Sunday trials in London have appeared in the Review, but rarely more than enough to let the readers know that there have been such trials, and that fines have been inflicted. Of the nature of the law and of the merits of the case, nothing has been said, and it has occurred to me that our brethren in America would be interested to know the exact situation.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.1*

There are some three dozen different Sunday laws on the statute-books in England, but the one that we are concerned with at present is an act of Parliament relating to factories. This act prescribes the hours of labor, tells how long employees may be allowed to work continuously, fixes the hours of meals, regulates the sanitary arrangement of workshops, and provides for the guarding of all machinery, so that no one can be endangered thereby. The one item over which there is controversy in our case is the following:—*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.2*

“A child, young person, or woman may not be employed on Sundays.”*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.3*

A “child” is defined by the act to be a person over ten and under fourteen years of age. “Young person” means a person of either sex who is over fourteen but under eighteen years of age. A woman is a female over eighteen.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.4*

Although a very large publishing work is carried on by the Tract Society, in London, the printing work is comparatively small, since all the huge subscription books are manufactured by outside firms. Only the *Present Truth*, tracts, pamphlets, and some small books are done in our own office. Consequently our working force is smaller than are most of our other offices. In the list of employees

are a few women and one “young person,” who do the class of work that is commonly done by such persons in all printing-offices. As a matter of course, we work six days and rest the seventh day, according to the commandment.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.5*

This state of things existed from the beginning of the work here, and although factory inspectors had visited the office at intervals, and were informed that work was done on Sundays the same as on other working days, there was no interference with the work until a little over a year ago. At that time the authorities seemed suddenly to be seized with a new energy. They indicated several changes which must be made in the arrangement of machinery. They pointed out that we were unconsciously violating the law in allowing employees who lived at a distance to bring their lunch and eat it on the premises. Some other details were indicated, in which changes must be made, all of which were promptly complied with.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 777.6*

At the same time they said that women and young persons must stop working on Sundays. It was set before the visiting inspector that we were fully complying with the spirit of the Factory Act as to protection of employees, and the number of hours of labor, and he let the matter go until he could confer with his superiors. As the result of this, we were told that the Jews were exempt from the Sunday clause of the act, and that if we would fill out one of the regular blanks, stating that we were Jews, Sunday work could go on as before. Of course this could not be done, as we could not deny that we are Christians.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.1*

The decision, however, not to yield to the requirement of the Sunday clause of the Factory Act, was not hastily made. For several weeks it was complied with, along with the other requirements. The women were told not to come to work on Sundays. But the inconsistency of such a course in those who are teaching the third angel's message became more and more apparent, until finally, after careful deliberation, it was decided that no difference could be made between Sunday and the other working days of the week. Accordingly, work was resumed on Sundays as usual, and the prosecutions and fines, of which you

have heard, have resulted. At the present writing the third fine has been imposed, and the warrants for collecting it by distress have been issued, but not yet served. The present fine is forty-two pounds (£205) and costs.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.2*

Now for a brief statement of the reasons which led to the above-mentioned decision:—*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.3*

At first, as already stated, the thought that it was only a Factory Act, and that it did not require absolute nor universal rest, caused us to think that the Sunday clause could be complied with as well as any of the other clauses. Careful thought upon the matter, however, led to the following conclusions. The fourth commandment requires the sanctification of the seventh day; that is, that it must be distinguished from all the other days of the week, by resting upon it, and habitual working upon them. This law knows no respect of persons. It speaks to women and to young persons as well as to men.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.4*

Further, the message of the third angel of *Revelation 14* sounds a warning against receiving the mark of the beast in the forehead or in the hand. This message includes all,—men, women, and children. The sin of receiving the mark, or of enforcing it, is without distinction of persons. This being the case, the managers of the office did not see how they could conscientiously comply with a law which required any person to cease work on Sunday for no other reason than that it was Sunday. For let it be understood that the requirement is not simply to guard women and young persons from overwork. If they were employed but two days in the week, and but two hours a day, and one of those days was Sunday, prosecution would follow just the same.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.5*

The suggestion that the authorities in making the law had no idea that it would interfere with any one's religion, is controverted by the fact that they exempted the Jews from its provisions, and that we might be exempt if we would deny that we are Christians. But it is a matter of no importance to us what their intentions were. We are to be guided by what the Bible says, and not by the intentions of the lawmakers; by our knowledge of truth, and not by their ignorance of it. When the Bible declares that it is a sin to recognize Sunday as

entitled to any consideration above other days, we must not bow down to it, no matter what other people may think about it. To worship a child's doll is as sinful as to worship a Chinese joss. The fact that one was not made with religious intent and the other was, makes no difference in the act. If we were living in ancient Spartan days, when stealing was counted a virtue and an act of patriotism, we should not be justified in stealing any more than if it were required as an act of defiance against God.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.6*

Men may not know what they are about when they introduce Sunday into their legislation, but the Devil knows very well, and thanks to the Lord, "we are not ignorant of his devices." We know that he is the head of the papacy, and that if the papacy had not under his leading substituted Sunday for the Sabbath of the Lord, no mention of Sunday more than any other day would be made in the laws of States. If, when we know these facts, we do not do all we can to let the world know them, we are guilty before God. People are in danger of being destroyed for lack of knowledge. It is our business to show the civil authorities that in exalting Sunday to any degree above other days, they are following the lead of the papacy, and that every Sunday statute is an act of defiance against the authority of God. We must not expect that the great deceiver will label all his acts, so that everybody may see their origin.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.7*

This affords sufficient answer to the exhortation to suffer injustice and inconvenience rather than have any trouble with the authorities. If it were simply a question of inconvenience, or of suffering injustice, we should be guilty of resisting the ordinance of God if we made any resistance. But it is not. God is the highest authority, and Christ is the Master of all. In all our service to men we must do it "as unto the Lord." If men lay unjust burdens upon us, we must be patient "unto the coming of the Lord." The characteristic of "the just" is that they do not resist oppression. *James 5:6, 7*. But neither do they sin against God. They may obey unjust demands, but not sinful ones.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.8*

A little note that appeared in the REVIEW a few weeks ago, stating that the brethren in London did not claim that there had been any

religions persecution, seemed calculated to mislead some as to the exact condition of things. It is true that we have carefully avoided any reference to "persecution." We have done this because we did not wish to obscure the real issue. Whether or not we are persecuted is a small matter compared with the fact that men are defying God and not realizing that they are doing a fearful thing. Our rights are nothing compared with the rights of God. He has a right not only to our service, but to the service of all men, including governors and kings. Our sole business on earth is as ambassadors to secure these rights to him as far as possible. It is very pleasant to have people sympathize with us, but it is far more desirable to have them perceive how they are wronging God and their own souls. So although we regard this question as purely a religious one, we have said nothing about persecution. Our desire is that people may see that the case is not between us and the State, but between the State and God. The one thing that the people of earth need to learn is that the law of God is paramount to customs or even laws of men. We must let the authorities know that it is as much a sin for them to make and enforce Sunday laws, as for us to keep them.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.9*

One more important feature of this case should be added to the foregoing. It is this: that amendments to the Factory Act are continually being made in response to the demands of the labor unions. At the last session of Parliament some additions were made. The Trades Union Congress, which met last September, instructed its Parliamentary committee, some of whom are members of Parliament, to "draw up a bill, and secure its being introduced into Parliament, prohibiting manufacturing processes being carried on from Saturday noon to Monday morning."*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.10*

This, it will be seen, is designed to stop all labor in factories, by men as well as by women. The probabilities are that it will be passed, since the tendency of the times is in that direction. In connection with that, another amendment is to be introduced, prohibiting employers from sending work out to be done in the homes of employees. If these proposed bills become law, the result will be that no manufacturing operations at all will be allowed Sunday.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.11*

Now it needs but a superficial acquaintance with the “demands of labor,” to see what step must inevitably follow this legislation. If all factory operations are forbidden on Sunday, whether in factories or in private houses, a cry of “unfair competition” will be raised if other people are allowed to work on their own account. Therefore, the next step must be the forbidding of all work on Sundays, and all “for the good of the people.” It thus appears that this present Sunday clause in the Factory Act is but the thin end of the wedge. If we comply with the requirement of this, because it is “only a Factory Act,” where shall we stop short of absolute rest on Sunday?*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.12*

No doubt there will be exceptions even to such a law, so that the street-cars will run as usual, and milk and some other things will be allowed to be sold. But if we may comply with a Sunday law that makes no religious claim, and is not absolutely universal in its demands, what objection can we raise against Constantine’s famous Sunday law! There is more in this matter than appears on the surface; but for what purpose does God make known to us the deep things of his law if it is not that we may discern the deep plots of Satan?*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.13*

These are the facts in the case, and the principles upon which we here met them. We have not dared to plead our convenience, our belief or religious principles, or our conscience, as against the law, but only the law of God, which speaks to all men as well as to us. The results of the agitation, as far as we can see, has been for the furtherance of the truth. As a direct result, more people in the United Kingdom have learned of the truth within the past year than in all the previous years that work has been carried on. Not a few have begun to keep the Sabbath, and many are trembling over the decision. As to what steps should be taken in for the future, we pray the Lord to direct, and we ask the prayers of the brethren to the same end.*ARSH December 3, 1895, page 778.14*

E. J. WAGGONER.

December 17, 1895

“The Prosecution in London” *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 72, 51.

EJW

E. J. Waggoner

The communication given below was sent by the directors of the International Tract Society in London to the Home Secretary. This officer has charge of the administration of Sunday laws. We copy from the *Present Truth*:—*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.1*

“The Board of Directors of the International Tract Society, Limited, beg respectfully that you will allow them to call your attention to the following facts, showing the operation of the Sunday clause in the Factory Act in the case of our printing works, situated at 451, Holloway Road, N.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.2*

“By the seizure of machinery and materials to satisfy fines imposed for allowing certain women and young persons to work on Sunday we are compelled to close the factory.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.3*

“For six years in our present factory our work was allowed to proceed without interference. Visiting Inspectors recognized the fact that the spirit of the Act was complied with, and that the violation was only technical. We being observers of the seventh day of the week, and all our employees being of like faith, our works have been entirely closed on the Sabbath, and opened on Sunday.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.4*

“Further, had we been able conscientiously to sign the Jewish exemption form we might have continued without interference. But we are Christians-the International Tract Society, Limited being one of the publishing branches of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination-and cannot truthfully enter ourselves as Jews under the Act thus the administration of the law discriminates against us as Christians, forbidding that which would be allowed us did we falsely declare ourselves Jews.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page*

“We have not been contending for our rights nor for our convenience in doing business. But God’s right to our obedience to the Fourth Commandment is not ours to surrender, nor can we obey that commandment to keep the Sabbath holy and at the same time keep the Sunday,-an institution established by human authority in opposition to the Sabbath,-even as we could not serve God and at the same time recognize other gods. In effect the law has sought to compel us to recognize a religious institution which loyalty to the Law of God requires that we should not observe.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.6*

“We acknowledge the uniform courtesy of Her Majesty’s Inspectors who have taken this new departure regarding our relation to the Factory Act, but we have felt it not disrespectful to address you this note of remonstrance against the action of the law by which the work of our factory is stopped and our factory employees deprived of this means of earning a livelihood. In the Act these are named as ‘protected persons,’ but by the operation of the Act they have been shut out from their work.*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.7*

“We respectfully submit that this is an injustice not contemplated by the framers of the Act.”*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.8*

The *Star*, a prominent London paper, has the following to say on the case:—*ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.9*

“The *Present Truth* is the organ of the International Tract Society, Limited, which is one of the publishing branches of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination, which holds that the true Sabbath is Saturday, the seventh day of the week, and not Sunday, the first. The *Present Truth* people, therefore, rest on Saturday and work on Sunday. Now the Factory Act forbids the employment of women and young persons on Sunday, and the only exemption which is dispenses is in the case of the Jews, who are passed over if they sign a special exemption form. The *Present Truth* conscientiously objected to signing this Jewish exemption form, because it is Christian and not Jewish, and for six years the factory inspectors let it print in peace, recognizing the patent fact that it kept the law in spirit if not in letter. The other day, however, some new broom

came along, and swept the *Present Truth* before a magistrate who fined it. it having refused to pay the fines, the bailiffs descended on it, confiscated all they could lay their hands on, including the engine, wherefore the *Present Truth* is likely soon to be the *Past Truth*. This is about the savagest instance we ever saw of the injustice of justice, and we hope that Sir Matthew White Ridley will make restitution as swiftly as may be." *ARSH December 17, 1895, page 812.10*

